

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of December 17, 2004 has been received and its contents reviewed. Prior to the Office Action, claims 1-11 were pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, and 11 have been amended and claims 8-10 have been canceled. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the Specification, for example, on page 5, line 1, to page 6, line 4, and page 7, lines 8-13. Thus, claims 1-7, and 11 are pending for consideration. By the actions above and the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Amendments to the Specification**

The specification is amended herein to correct several typographical errors. No new matter has been introduced.

In particular, 2-nitro-4-bromoacetamide (NBA) was incorrectly written as 2-nitro-4-bromoacetanilide several times in the specification, in particular, in line 10 on page 1, line 27 on page 4, and line 6 on page 14. These inadvertent errors are corrected by this Amendment.

In addition, as the Office pointed out on page 2 of the Office Action, 3,3',4-4'-tetraminobiphenyl should be written as 3,3',4,4'-tetraminobiphenyl. This inadvertent error was found on lines 20 and 23-24 of page 4 of the Specification, and is corrected by this Amendment.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. Applicants traverse.

In particular, the Office asserts that claim 1 is indefinite since it refers to the nitro-4-bromoacetamide as "formula 1" and formula 1 is the compound 3,3',4,4'-tetraminobiphenyl, and that 3,3',4-4'-tetraminobiphenyl in line 1 should be correctly written as 3,3',4,4'-tetraminobiphenyl. As shown above, claim 1 as amended clearly recites "a process for producing 3,3',4,4'-tetraminobiphenyl (TAB) of formula 1". In addition, minor formatting amendments are being made to more clearly recite the claimed invention, in particular,

formulas 2 and 4 have been moved within claim 1. No changes to formulas 2 and 4 have been made. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office also asserts “methnol” in claim 3 should be correctly spelled as “methanol”. Claim 3 as amended corrects this typographical error. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office asserts that there is insufficient basis for the limitation “the coupling agent” in claim 10. Applicants believe this rejection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 10 by this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants submit that each of claims 2-7, and 11 are now allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1 and in light of the Amendments herein. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of each of claims 1-7 and 11 be withdrawn.

**Objections under 37 CFR § 1.75(c)**

The Office has objected to claims 8-10 under 37 CFR §1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, and thus, Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Applicants traverse.

In particular, the Office asserts that claim 8 broadens the reactants capable of being used in claim 1, in that claim 1 is limited to the use of a specific aryl bromide and a specific boronic acid, and the use of “aryl halides” and a “variety of boronic acids” actually broadens the claim on which it depends. Therefore, the Office asserts that it fails to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants believe this objection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 8 by this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office asserts that claim 9 fails to further limit the base claim since the word “preferably” actually suggests that compounds other than NBA could be used in claim 1, and claim 1 teaches only the use of NBA. Applicants believe this objection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 9 by this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office asserts that claim 10 fails to further limit the base claim since it sets forth the reactants in the language “selected from the group consisting of ...”, while, in claim 1, only NBA and NAPB are used as reactants. Thus, the Office asserts that no other reactants can be used without broadening the base claim, and that the recitation of the only reactants used in the base claim does not further limit the claim. Applicants believe this objection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 10 by this Amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office stated that claims 1-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In particular, the Office asserts that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the claims process of making 3,3', 4,4' tetraminobiphenyl, and that the use of the claimed reactants is not suggested in the prior art. Thus, in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2005

DRS/SMH

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000



Donald R. Studebaker  
Registration No. 32,815